



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

JAN 5 2001

COMMISSIONER UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND  
DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

R-2001-41

In re

DECISION ON  
PETITION FOR REGRADE  
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 10.7(c)

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

(petitioner) petitions for regrading his answers to questions 3, 7 and 11 of the morning section and questions 16, 25, 48 and 49 of the afternoon section of the Registration Examination held on April 12, 2000. The petition is denied to the extent petitioner seeks a passing grade on the Registration Examination.

**BACKGROUND**

An applicant for registration to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) in patent cases must achieve a passing grade of 70 in both the morning and afternoon sections of the Registration Examination. Petitioner scored 68. On July 28, 2000, petitioner requested regrading, arguing that the model answers were incorrect.

As indicated in the instructions for requesting regrading of the Examination, in order to expedite a petitioner's appeal rights, all regrade requests have been considered in the first instance by the Director of the USPTO.

**OPINION**

Under 37 C.F.R. § 10.7(c), petitioner must establish any errors that occurred in the grading of the Examination. The directions state: "No points will be awarded for incorrect answers or unanswered questions." The burden is on petitioners to show that their chosen answers are the most correct answers.

The directions to the morning and afternoon sections state in part:

Do not assume any additional facts not presented in the questions. When answering each question, unless otherwise stated, assume that you are a registered patent practitioner. Any reference to a practitioner is a reference to a registered patent practitioner. The most correct answer is the policy, practice, and procedure which must, shall, or should be followed in accordance with the U.S. patent statutes, the PTO rules of practice and procedure, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), and the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) articles and rules, unless modified by a subsequent court decision or a notice in the *Official Gazette*. There is only one most correct answer for each question. Where choices (A) through (D) are correct and choice (E) is "All of the above," the last choice (E) will be the most correct answer and the only answer which will be accepted. Where two or more choices are correct, the most correct answer is the answer which refers to each and every one of the correct choices. Where a question includes a statement with one or more blanks or ends with a colon, select the answer from the choices given to complete the statement which would make the statement true. Unless otherwise explicitly stated, all references to patents or applications are to be understood as being U.S. patents or regular (non-provisional) utility applications for utility inventions only, as opposed to plant or design applications for plant and design inventions. Where the terms "USPTO," "PTO," or "Office" are used in this examination, they mean the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

Petitioner has presented various arguments attacking the validity of the model answers.

All of petitioner's arguments have been fully considered. Each question in the Examination is worth one point.

No credit has been awarded for morning questions 3, 7 and 11 and afternoon questions 16, 25, 48 and 49. Petitioner's arguments for these questions are addressed individually below.

Morning question 3 reads as follows:

3. A multiple dependent claim:

(A) may indirectly serve as a basis for another multiple dependent claim.

(B) added by amendment to a pending patent application should not be entered until the proper fee has been received by the PTO.

(C) may directly serve as a basis for another multiple dependent claim.

(D) is properly construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of each of the particular claims to which it refers.

(E) (B) and (D).

The model answer is choice (E).

Choice (E) is correct because (B) and (D) are correct. 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c); MPEP § 608.01(n) [pp. 600-66,67]. (A) and (C) are incorrect. MPEP § 608.01(n) (“[A] multiple dependent claim may not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim, either directly or indirectly”).

Petitioner argues that answer (D) is also correct. Petitioner contends that answer (B) is incorrect because additional fees are not required where multiple dependent claims are filed initially. Petitioner concludes that answer (E) is incorrect and maintains that answer (D) is correct.

Petitioner’s argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner’s statement that additional fees are not required where multiple dependent claims are filed initially, answer (B) specifically states that a multiple dependent claim added by amendment to a pending patent application should not be entered until the proper fee has been received by the PTO. See 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c); MPEP § 608.01(n) [pp. 600-66,67]. There is no statement that the amendment replaces claims - but that the amendment adds claims. The statement in answer (B) is correct and therefore answer (E) is the best answer because it states that both (B) and (D) are true. No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner’s request for credit on this question is denied.

Morning question 7 reads as follows:

7. An application directed to hand shearing of sheep includes the following incomplete independent Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-3.

Claim 1. An apparatus for shearing sheep, said apparatus comprising:

(i) a first cutting member having a first cutting edge at one end and a thumb loop at the other end;

(ii) a second cutting member having a second cutting edge at one end and a finger loop at the other end;

(iii) \_\_\_\_\_;

(iv) said second cutting member additionally including a pointer loop between said finger loop and said mid-point, said pointer loop having a pointer loop center, said finger loop having a finger loop center and said pointer loop having a pointer loop center such that a plane through said finger loop center and said pointer loop center is generally parallel to said second cutting edge for improved balance.

Claim 2. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said first cutting member includes a threaded aperture extending entirely through said first cutting member between said thumb loop and said mid-point, and an adjusting screw that extends through said threaded aperture to engage a bearing surface below the pointer loop on said second cutting member.

Claim 3. The apparatus of claim 2, wherein said connector is a rivet.

Which of the following most broadly completes missing paragraph (iii) of Claim 1?

(A) "wherein said first cutting member and said second cutting member are pivotally secured to each other at respective mid-points, and wherein said finger loop is padded; and"

(B) "said first cutting member having a mid-point between its ends and said second cutting member having a mid-point between its ends, wherein said first cutting member and said second cutting member are pivotally secured to each other at their respective mid-points by a connector; and"

(C) "said first cutting member including a reservoir for dispensing disinfectant solution and having a mid-point between its ends, said second cutting member having a mid-point between its ends, and wherein said first cutting member and said second cutting member are pivotally secured to each other at their respective mid-points by a connector; and"

(D) "said first cutting member and said second cutting member being pivotally secured to each other by a connector; and"

(E) "said first cutting member having a mid-point between its ends and said second cutting member having a mid-point between its ends, and said first cutting member and said second cutting member are pivotally secured to each other at their respective mid-points; and"

The model answer is choice (B).

Answer (B) provides proper antecedent basis for "said mid-point" in part (iv) of Claim 1 and in Claim 2, and "said connector" in Claim 3. Answer (A) is incorrect at least because it does not provide antecedent basis for "said connector" in Claim 3. Answer (C) is narrower than Answer (B) because it includes the additional limitation of a reservoir and therefore does not "most broadly" complete claim 1. Answer (D) is incorrect because it does not provide proper antecedent basis for "said mid-point" in part (iv) of Claim 1 and in Claim 2. Answer (E) is incorrect because it does not provide antecedent basis for "said connector" in Claim 3.

Petitioner argues that none of the answers is correct. Petitioner contends that answer (D) is the better answer because, although it is incorrect, it is the most broad among all the answers and all answers are incorrect. Petitioner contends that answer (B) is incorrect because said midpoint is indefinite and that answer (B) is more narrow than answer (D) and therefore not the best answer.

Petitioner's argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that answer (B) also lacks antecedent basis for "said midpoint", answer (B) specifically states that "said first cutting member **having a mid-point** between its ends and said second cutting member **having a mid-point** between its ends, wherein said first cutting member and said second cutting member are pivotally secured to each other **at their respective mid-points** by a connector; and." The phrase "said mid-point" in (iv) is specifically the mid-point of the second cutting member set forth in (B), and therefore answer (B) provides proper antecedent basis for "said mid-point" in (iv). Therefore, answer (B) is correct and answer (D),

admitted to being incorrect by petitioner, cannot be a better answer than correct answer (B). No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Morning question 11 reads as follows:

Please answer questions 10 and 11 based on the following facts. Mario Lepieux was a member of a Canadian national hockey team touring Europe. While traveling through Germany (a WTO member country) in December 1998, Mario conceived of an aerodynamic design for a hockey helmet that offered players improved protection while reducing air resistance during skating. Upon Mario's return to Canada (a NAFTA country), he enlisted his brothers Luigi and Pepe Lepieux to help him market the product under the tradename "Wing Cap." On February 1, 1999, without Mario's knowledge or permission, Luigi anonymously published a promotional article written by Mario and fully disclosing how the Wing Cap was made and used. The promotional article was published in Moose Jaw Monthly, a regional Canadian magazine that is not distributed in the United States. The Wing Cap was first reduced to practice on March 17, 1999. A United States patent application properly naming Mario as the sole inventor was filed September 17, 1999. That application has now been rejected as being anticipated by the Moose Jaw Monthly article.

11. Which of the following statements is most correct?

(A) In a priority contest against another inventor, Mario can rely on his activities in Canada in establishing a date of invention.

(B) In a priority contest against another inventor, Mario can rely on his activities in Germany in establishing a date of invention.

(C) Mario can rely on his activities in Canada in establishing a date of invention prior to publication of the regional Canadian magazine article.

(D) (A) and (C).

(E) (A), (B), and (C).

The model answer is choice (E).

Mario may rely on activities in both Germany (a WTO member country) and Canada (a NAFTA country) in establishing a date of invention prior to publication of the Moose Jaw Monthly article or in establishing priority. 35 U.S.C. § 104; see also MPEP § 715.01(c).

Petitioner argues that both (A) and (B) are correct, but not (C) and because there is no answer stating that both (A) and (B) but not (C) are correct, either (A) or (B) should be given credit. Petitioner contends that (C) is incorrect because the article was published before the invention was reduced to practice.

Petitioner's argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that (C) is incorrect because the article was published before the invention was reduced to practice, the answer (C) specifically states that Mario can rely on his activities in Canada in establishing a date of invention prior to publication of the regional Canadian magazine article. Accordingly, the question asks about establishing a date of invention, which 35 USC 104 allows activities in a NAFTA country to be considered in establishing, not a date of reduction to practice, rendering answer (C) correct. No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 16 reads as follows:

Please answer questions 16 and 17 based on the following facts. On February 15, 1999, Debbie conceived a unique system for humanely caging hunting dogs and automatically feeding them at appropriate times. Debbie told her husband, Ted, about her idea that night, and the two spent the next four months working regularly on the concept. Ted built a cage that implemented the concept on June 17, 1999, and tested it on his own dogs for a week. It worked perfectly for its intended purpose. The next day, Ted visited a family friend, Ginny, who happened to be a registered practitioner, and asked her to prepare a patent application on Debbie's behalf. Ginny declined representation, explaining that she was in the middle of trial preparation and would not be able to work on the application for at least four months. Ginny gave Ted the names of a number of qualified patent practitioners, suggesting he consider retaining one of them to promptly prepare the patent application, and explained that a delay in filing the patent application could prejudice Debbie's patent rights. Ted, however, felt uncomfortable going to a practitioner he did not know personally, and did not contact any of the individuals recommended by Ginny. After Ginny had completed her trial and was back in the office, Ted visited her on December 1, 1999.

At that time Ginny agreed to represent Debbie. An application was filed in the PTO within 10 days.

On May 15, 1999, Billie conceived an idea substantively identical to Debbie's. Billie immediately prepared a detailed technical description including drawings and visited a registered practitioner. Billie filed a patent application on June 14, 1999. Later, on July 9, 1999, Billie built a cage that implemented the concept and had fully tested it by August 11, 1999.

16. Assuming Debbie's patent application is substantively identical to Billie's patent application, which of the following statements is most correct?

- (A) Nearly simultaneous invention by Debbie and Billie is proof that the invention is obvious and precludes patentability.
- (B) Nearly simultaneous invention by Debbie and Billie may be evidence of the level of skill in the art at the time of the invention.
- (C) Nearly simultaneous invention by Debbie and Billie may be evidence of a long-felt need for the invention.
- (D) Nearly simultaneous invention by Debbie and Billie may be evidence of commercial success of the invention.
- (E) Statements (A), (B), (C) and (D) are each incorrect.

The model answer is choice (B).

Selection (B) is correct as per *The International Glass Company, Inc. v. United States*, 159 USPQ 434 (US Cl Ct, 1968); *In re Merck & Co.*, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Newell Cos. v. Kenney Mfg.*, 9 USPQ2d 1417 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Monarch Knitting Machinery Corp. v. Sulzer Morat GmbH*, 45 USPQ2d 1977 (Fed. Cir. 1998). Statement (A) is not correct because, although nearly simultaneous invention may be a factor in making an obviousness determination, it does not in itself preclude patentability. *Environmental Designs, Ltd. v. Union Oil Co.*, 218 USPQ 865 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Statements (C) and (D) are incorrect because nearly simultaneous invention bears on neither long-felt need nor commercial success. Statement (E) is incorrect because statement (B) is correct.

Petitioner argues that none of the answers is correct. Petitioner contends that the question is improper because the model answer is subjective in light of a purported omission in the MPEP on



the examined point. Petitioner concludes that answer (B) is incorrect and maintains that answer (E) is correct because it is the only answer indicating all other answers are incorrect.

Petitioner's argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. *International Glass* stated at 442, "[t]he fact of near simultaneous invention, though not determinative of statutory obviousness, is strong evidence of what constitutes the level of ordinary skill in the art." *Merck* stated at 380, "[t]he additional, although unnecessary, evidence of contemporaneous invention is probative of 'the level of knowledge in the art at the time the invention was made.' In re Farrenkopf, 713 F.2d 714, 720, 219 USPQ 1, 6 (Fed. Cir. 1983)." *Monarch Knitting* stated at 1983, "[t]his court has noted the relevance of contemporaneous independent invention to the level of ordinary knowledge or skill in the art", referring to *Merck*. Accordingly, nearly simultaneous invention by Debbie and Billie may be evidence of the level of skill in the art at the time of the invention, rendering the statement in answer (B) correct. The instructions explicitly indicate that the best answer may be that supported by case law. Whether such case law is indexed in the MPEP is not relevant. No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 25 reads as follows:

25. You filed a patent application on behalf of Smith, an employee of Fix Corporation. The application contains a power of attorney authorizing you to transact all business before the Office on behalf of Smith. After the application is filed, Smith assigns all rights in the application to Fix Corp. In which of the following situations will the power of attorney granted to you be properly revoked?

I. Joe, in-house corporate counsel at Fix Corp., but not an officer of Fix, signs a submission, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b), establishing ownership of the entire interest in the application by Fix Corp., and forwards the submission along with a revocation of the power of attorney granted

to you, to the PTO. Joe is not a registered practitioner, and he has not been authorized to bind Fix Corp.

II. Smith refuses to revoke the power of attorney given to you, but Snix, president of Fix Corp., signs a submission, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 3.73(b), establishing ownership of the entire interest in the application by Fix Corp., and forwards the submission along with a Snix-signed revocation of the power of attorney granted to you, to the PTO.

III. Joe, in-house corporate counsel at Fix Corp., advises Snix, president of Fix Corp., that the assignment by Smith to Fix Corp, automatically operates as a revocation of the power of attorney granted to you, and Snix relies upon Joe's advice in good faith and takes no further action toward revoking the power of attorney. Joe is not a registered practitioner, and he has not been authorized to bind Fix Corp.

- (A) I.
- (B) II.
- (C) III.
- (D) I and II.
- (E) None of the above.

The model answer is choice (B).

Selection (B) is correct as per MPEP 324, and 402.07. The submission may be signed by a person in the organization having apparent authority to sign on behalf of the organization – an officer. In (B), the submission is signed by the President, an office having apparent authority. (I) and (III) are incorrect since Joe is neither a registered practitioner nor an officer of the company. (III) also is incorrect since the assignment by Smith to Fix does not automatically operate as a revocation of the power of attorney. 37 C.F.R. § 1.36. Thus, (A), (C), and (D) are incorrect. (E) is incorrect since (B) is correct.

Petitioner argues that I is also correct and therefore answer (D), the answer stating that both I and II are correct is the best answer. Petitioner contends that I would be correct where state law provided that an in-house corporate counsel may have the inherent ability to revoke powers of attorney. Petitioner concludes that answer (B) is incorrect because I is also correct and maintains that answer (D) is the best answer.

Petitioner's argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that state law may provide in-house counsel the inherent right to revoke

powers of attorney, the question specifically states that Joe is not a registered practitioner, and he has not been authorized to bind Fix Corp. The instructions explicitly state to not assume any additional facts not presented in the questions. The factual basis for the question states that Joe lacks authority. Further, 35 U.S.C. § 31 states that the Commissioner may prescribe regulations governing the recognition and conduct of agents, attorneys, or other persons representing applicants or other parties before the Patent and Trademark Office. Accordingly, the question is not premised on state law, but rather PTO rules and regulations, rendering answer (B) incorrect. The statement in answer (B) is correct because II is correct, but not I. No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 48 reads as follows:

48. Which of the following statements regarding 35 U.S.C. § 103 is most correct?

- (A) PTO classification of prior art references used to reject a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, and the similarities and differences in structure and function carry equal weight as evidence of whether the references are analogous or non-analogous.
- (B) The question of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is resolved by determining whether the differences between the prior art and the claims would have been obvious.
- (C) Obviousness of an invention can be properly determined by identifying the "gist" of the invention, even where the "gist" does not take into regard an express limitation in the claims.
- (D) In delineating the invention, consideration is given not only to the subject matter recited in the claim, but also the properties of the subject matter which are inherent in the subject matter and disclosed in the specification.
- (E) Obviousness can be predicated on what is not known at the time an invention is made, where the inherency of the feature is later established.

The model answer is choice (D).

(D) is the most correct answer as per 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 620, 195 USPQ 6, 8 (CCPA 1977) ("In delineating the invention as a whole, we look not only to the subject matter which is literally recited in the claim in question... but also to those properties of the subject matter which are inherent in the subject matter *and* are disclosed in the specification..."); MPEP 2141.02 (section styled, "Disclosed Inherent Properties Are Part of 'As A Whole' Inquiry"). (A) is incorrect. MPEP 2141.01(a). PTO classification is some evidence of analogy/non-analogy, but structure and function carry more weight.

*In re Ellis*, 476 F.2d 1370, 1372, 177 USPQ 526, 527 (CCPA 1973).

(B) is incorrect. MPEP 2141.02. The question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

(C) is incorrect. MPEP 2141.02 (section styled, "Distilling The Invention Down To a 'Gist' or 'Thrust' Of An Invention Disregards 'As A Whole' Requirement"). *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984); *Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Mfg. Co.*, 810 F.2d 1561, 1 USPQ2d 1593 (Fed. Cir. 1987), *cert. denied*, 481 U.S. 1052 (1987) (district court improperly distilled claims down to a one word solution to a problem).

(E) is incorrect. As stated in MPEP 2141.02 (section styled, "Disclosed Inherent Properties Are Part Of 'As A Whole' Inquiry"), "Obviousness cannot be predicated on what is not known at the time an invention is made, even if the inherency of a certain feature is later established. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.2d 1531, 28 USPQ2d 1955 (Fed. Cir. 1993)."

Petitioner argues that (B) is correct. Petitioner contends that (B) is correct according to MPEP 2141. Petitioner contends that answer (D) is incorrect but gives no reason for such assertion.

Petitioner's argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that (D) is incorrect, the question specifically states that in delineating the invention, consideration is given not only to the subject matter recited in the claim, but also the properties of the subject matter which are inherent in the subject matter and disclosed in the specification. This is explained in *In re Antonie*, 559 F.2d 618, 620, 195 USPQ 6, 8 (CCPA 1977) ("In delineating the invention as a whole, we look not only to the subject matter which is literally recited in the claim in question... but also to those properties of the subject matter which are inherent in the subject matter *and* are disclosed in the specification..."); MPEP 2141.02

(section styled, "Disclosed Inherent Properties Art Part of 'As A Whole' Inquiry"). Accordingly, the statement in answer (D) is correct. Answer (B) is incorrect because, as explained in MPEP 2141.02, the question under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. *Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp.*, 713 F.2d 1530, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Answer (B) suggests that the differences alone are sufficient, which fails to meet the requirement that the invention as a whole would have been obvious. No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 49 reads as follows:

49. A parent application A was filed on September 9, 1988, and became abandoned on October 19, 1993. Application B was filed on October 21, 1993, and referred to application A as well as claimed the benefit of the filing date of application A. Application B issued as a patent on June 17, 1997. Application C was filed on October 29, 1993, and referred to application B as well as claimed the benefit of the filing date of application B. Application D was filed on December 20, 1996. Application D referred to application B and claimed the benefit of the filing date of application B. Both applications C and D were abandoned for failure to file a timely reply to Office actions that were mailed on April 20, 1999. Application E was filed on July 22, 1999 and is drawn to the same invention as claimed in applications C and D. Application E claims the benefit of the filing dates of applications A, B, C, and D, and makes reference to all preceding applications. The earliest effective filing date of application E with respect to any common subject matter in the prior applications is:

- (A) October 21, 1993.
- (B) December 20, 1996.
- (C) October 29, 1993.
- (D) September 9, 1988.
- (E) July 22, 1999.

The model answer is choice (E).

The applications C and D were abandoned after midnight of July 21, 1999, therefore they are technically not abandoned on July 21, 1999. There is no copendency between applications E and any prior application. MPEP § 201.11 ("If the first application is abandoned, the second

application must be filed before the abandonment in order for it to be co-pending with the first." See MPEP § 710.01(a), fourth paragraph.

Petitioner argues that answer (A) is correct. Petitioner contends that the facts pattern does not indicate shortened statutory periods and does not provide a calendar to determine whether any dates are weekends.

Petitioner's argument has been fully considered but is not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that the facts pattern does not indicate shortened statutory periods, the instructions specifically state that the most correct answer is the policy, practice, and procedure which must, shall, or should be followed in accordance with the U.S. patent statutes, the PTO rules of practice and procedure, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), and the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) articles and rules, unless modified by a subsequent court decision or a notice in the *Official Gazette*. As explained in MPEP § 710.02(b), under the authority given him by 35 USC § 133, the Commissioner has directed the examiner to set a shortened period for reply to every action. That same MPEP section also states that such shortened period is 3 months to reply to any Office action on the merits. Accordingly, applications C and D are assigned shortened periods according to the PTO rules of practice and procedure, rendering C and D abandoned at the time of E's filing and making the correct answer (E). As to the comment that the question fails to provide a calendar, no calendar is necessary to determine the correct answer as indicated above. The instructions indicate that no assumption beyond the indicated facts should be made. Therefore, there is no need to assume that any facts depend on the need for a calendar. No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.


The regrade of the petitioner's examination has been conducted fairly and without discrimination pursuant to a uniform standard using the PTO's model answers. See *Worley v. United States Patent and Trademark Office*, No. 99-1469, slip op. at 4 (D.D.C. Nov. 8, 2000)(The court held that the PTO's Model Answers are a uniform standard. "[S]ince all exams are graded in reference to [the Model Answers], use of the Model Answers fosters uniformity in grading and preclude[s] unfair and individually discriminatory grading." *Id.*, slip opinion at 5. The court concluded that "the decision of the Commissioner of the USPTO not to regrade Mr. Worley's examination answers as correct when the answers did not conform with the USPTO's Model Answers was not arbitrary and capricious." *Id.*, slip opinion at 5-6.)

**ORDER**

For the reasons given above, no points have been added to petitioner's score on the Examination. Therefore, petitioner's score is 68. This score is insufficient to pass the Examination.

Upon consideration of the request for regrade to the Director of the USPTO, it is ORDERED that the request for a passing grade on the Examination is denied.

This is a final agency action.

A large, stylized handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Robert J. Spar', is written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Spar  
Director, Office of Patent Legal Administration  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy